

thousand there, and pretty soon we are talking about the flood of money that saturates this place.

Our vote on the broadcasting industry tonight demonstrates the last thing that we need in this town is more money. Please vote against this amendment.

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

(Mr. BARTON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to give my colleagues a real world example under today's rules. Now, this is a Republican primary example; it is not Republican versus Democrat. There is a new seat down in Texas that my son is running in. He is running among six other primary Republicans, one of which spent \$4 million to run in a primary in Houston 2 years ago, \$4 million, and got beat by a gentleman who is sitting on this floor.

Now, under today's campaign finance rules, if my son is able to get somebody on the telephone, I mean that is pretty good, just get them on the phone and talk to them for 15 minutes, he might be able to get them to send him a check for \$1,000 in a race that he really needs to raise \$1 million, and that is a thousand phone calls that he is just not going to get made.

Now, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP) says, let us at least raise this thing for inflation so that if my son can get somebody on the phone, he may be able to get \$2,000. He is still not going to match the \$4 million that was spent 2 years ago, but he may be able to double the efficiency.

If we were talking about raising this to \$100,000, some of my friends might have an argument against it, but going from \$1,000 to \$2,000, there is a real-world example, admittedly in a Republican primary, where this, if it were law today, would give a challenger candidate who is not a millionaire an opportunity to have a chance to get enough funding to at least be competitive.

So I rise in strong support of the Wamp amendment, and I ask for its adoption.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we have been down this road before. In 1998, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) had this amendment. It was debated in the same sense it was debated tonight, and it was soundly rejected. Mr. Chairman, 315 Members of this body voted no. We are on the recorded record on that.

In 1999 the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) again offered this amendment, the same debate, and 300 of us voted against it. Why? Because there is no reform in campaign reform if we are doubling the amount of

money that we are putting into the bill.

This is not reform. We are trying to do history tonight. We are trying to pass campaign finance reform. We cannot have reform out there with a message that says, well, we did reform, but we just doubled the amount of money that we can get from individual rich contributors. There is only one way to have campaign finance reform, and that is to defeat this amendment with the same 300 votes that voted against it in 1998 and 1999. You are on the record, do not flip flop.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. BALDACCIO).

Mr. BALDACCIO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for that exciting rendition. The points the gentleman made were very succinct, and I appreciate the gentleman raising those issues, including the number of Members who had voted on this measure the last time, the over 300 Members that voted against this amendment.

I want to thank the gentleman on the other side for the hard work that he has put forward in bringing about true campaign finance reform, but I do disagree with him on this amendment.

I agree with the premise that we do not need to add more money into the process; we should be looking at reducing it. The other thing that we need to remember is nobody is forcing anybody to run for office. People choose to run for office, and they should have that opportunity, and it should not be all about money, and it should be about their ideas.

I think this sends a totally wrong message. I would encourage the body to vote down this amendment, as they did vote down this amendment before, and say no to this kind of politics and yes to campaign finance reform.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remaining time.

Everybody here has been elected under the law that allows a \$1,000 limit. We had no problem getting elected. Many of us have been elected many, many times. There is nothing broke out there that needs fixing. The law is a good law, and let us keep that good law so that we can have good, meaningful campaign finance reform tonight. Do not do it by throwing away the message by doubling the amount of contributions that one can take if this amendment is passed. This is a bad amendment. Defeat it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, in trying to change that law, I yield the balance of our time to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This has been a spirited debate. We did not put it in our substitute so we would, in fact, have this debate. We are going to live with whatever the decision is afterwards, whether this amend-

ment fails or succeeds. I hope this amendment succeeds with all that I can urge. It is not a question of going from the \$1,000 to \$2,000, it is a question of going from \$2 million to \$2,000, or a half a million to \$2,000, or \$200,000 to \$2,000.

We have gotten elected in part because of all of this soft money which we are going to see disappear. We are going to return it back to individual Americans.

Mr. Chairman, \$2,000 is more than \$1,000, but it should be \$3,500 if we were looking at 1974. I urge my colleagues as Democrats and Republicans to support this amendment.

This bill may become law. We are going to have to live with it for the next many, many years, and I think my colleagues will agree that \$2,000 will be better in the years to come than \$1,000 and will make it equal to the Senate.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to oppose the Wamp amendment, which doubles the amount of money an individual can donate to a candidate, known as hard money, from \$1000 to \$2000. I personally believe that we should decrease this maximum amount by 50% to \$500 if we are really serious about campaign finance reform. The Wamp amendment is a complete step backwards in trying to get the money out of our political system.

As Public Campaign states in its report, *The Color of Money*, "It is an indisputable fact of our political system that those candidates and laws favored by wealthy contributors usually prevail over those whose backers, or would-be backers, cannot afford to give large sums. As American University law professor Jamin Raskin has stated, this system is 'every bit as exclusionary to poorer candidates and voters as the regime of the high filing fee and the poll tax' was in discriminating against African Americans and poor people in the South."

Because of wage disparities and lower incomes in minority and poor communities, these constituencies don't have the resources to contribute to campaigns. We only further disenfranchise them if we raise the amount of hard money that an individual can contribute. Additionally, this hard money system makes it much harder for women, people of color, and low-income people to run for office. This is undemocratic. Allowing that amount to be doubled will only give wealthy people even more influence in our political system.

We see that influence every day. For example, wealthy Enron and Arthur Andersen executives gave almost \$800,000 in \$1000 contributions since the 1990 election cycle according to U.S. Public Interest Research Group. Do we want to give these executives even more influence over Congress?

A 2000 poll by the Mellman group found that 81 percent of voters either support lowering the \$1000 hard money limit or keeping it the same. The American people oppose the Wamp amendment and we should, too. I urge my colleagues to vote no on this very discriminatory amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.